REMARKS

Status of the Claims

In the Office Action mailed January 25, 2008, the Examiner noted that claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-10 were pending and rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-10. Claims 1, 4, 5 and 7-10 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, no new claim has been added; and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-10 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter is believed to have been added. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed below.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

On page 3, item 6, the Office Action rejected claims 1, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Pettersen (Patent No. 6,826,594B1, filed July 15, 2000).

Pettersen is related to an electronic commerce ("e-commerce") system that dynamically constructs a web page via electronic links over a global electronic network, such as the Internet (see column 1, lines 24-27 of Pettersen).

However, it is submitted that Pettersen fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, "a contents information process portion", as recited in claim 1. According to Pettersen, the entire user designated setup attributes are stored on the host server keyed by a unique user identification (UID) number (see column 24, lines 31-33 of Pettersen). The UID number is passed to the host server during remote web page initialization to access and process the user designated setup attributes (see column 24, lines 33-35 of Pettersen).

Stated another way, Pettersen describes storing the entire designated setup attributes keyed by a unique user identification number, which is used to access and process the user designated setup attributes during initialization of the web page, whereas the contents information process portion makes a storage portion store the determined dynamically-altered contents in connection with Web page identifying information on the Web page and user identifying information on the user, as in claim 1.

Further, it is submitted that Pettersen fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, "a designation reception portion", as recited in claim 1. According to Pettersen, the dynamic content is inserted in a designated portion of the web page defined by at least one content display attribute based on the dynamic content host server code embedded in the web page

7

(see column 4, lines 29-37 of Pettersen). Further, column 27, lines 18-32 of Pettersen describes receiving a request including an ID that identifies the affiliate web site (PID) and an advertisement identification number (AID).

However, neither column discloses, either expressly or inherently, a designation reception portion that receives, from an administrator, designation of Web page identifying information and user identifying information, as recited in claim 1, because the cited portions of Pettersen are merely concerned with inserting dynamic content into a designated portion of the web page and receiving a request that includes an ID that identifies the PID and the AID.

Moreover, it is submitted that Pettersen also fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, "a contents information extraction portion", "a Web page regeneration portion" and "a regenerated Web page transmission portion", as recited in claim 1.

With respect to the "Web page regeneration portion", the Office Action asserted that column 11, lines 28-39 of Pettersen discloses such a feature, as quoted above. However, it is submitted that column 11, lines 28-39 of Pettersen fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, the feature quoted above, because column 11, lines 28-39 of Peterson is merely concerned with *dynamically* rearranging or regenerating the web page to take advantage of dynamically changing conditions, instead of using the Web page regeneration portion to "regenerat[e] the Web page by incorporating therein the extracted contents of the Web page", as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, in view of the above, it is submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Pettersen. Further, claims 8 and 9 have been amended to emphasize features similar to those in amended claim 1. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 8 and 9 are patentable over Pettersen.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

On page 6, item 8, the Office Action rejected claims 2 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pettersen (Patent No. 6,826,594B1; filed July 15, 2000) in view of Hawes (Patent No. U.S. 6,094,662, filed April 30, 1998.

It is submitted that claim 2, which depends from claim 1, is patentable over Pettersen for at least the same reasons as base claim 1. Further, nothing was cited or found in Hawes that cures the deficiencies of Pettersen as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 2 is patentable over Pettersen and Hawes, taken alone or in combination.

Claim 10, as amended, recites

> contents information process portion making a storage portion store the
> determined dynamically-altered contents in connection with Web page identifying
> information on the Web page, user identifying information on the user and date-
> and-time specifying information specifying date-and-time of the determining

(claim 10, lines 6-10). Therefore, it is submitted that claim 10 is patentable over Pettersen for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. Further, nothing was cited or found in Hawes that cures the deficiencies of Pettersen as discussed above. Thus, it is submitted that claim 10 is patentable over Pettersen and Hawes, taken alone or in combination.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

On page 11, item 10, the Office Action rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Isaac in view of Carlson (Patent No. 6,697,849B1; filing date: May 1, 2000) further in view of Pettersen. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4, as amended, recites "a contents information process logic unit making a storage portion store the determined dynamically-altered contents in connection with Web page identifying information on the Web page and user identifying information on the user" (claim 4, lines 6-10). Therefore, it is submitted that claim 4 is patentable over Pettersen for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. Further, nothing was found in Carlson or Isaac, taken alone or in combination, that discloses, either expressly implicitly, the feature of claim 4, as quoted above. Thus, it is submitted that claim 4 is patentable over Isaac, Carlson, and Pettersen and for the additional reasons presented below.

Further, it is submitted that claim 4 is also patentable over Isaac, Carlson, and Pettersen, as none of the references, taken alone or in combination, disclose, either expressly or implicitly, the feature of:

> a designation reception logic unit receiving, from an administrator, designation of
> Web page identifying information and user identifying information; and

> a replay logic unit regenerating the Web page by incorporating therein
> dynamically-altered contents that are stored in the storage portion and
> correspond to the Web page identifying information and the user identifying
> information both of which are designated by the administrator to transmit the
> regenerated Web page to a terminal device of the administrator

(claim 4, lines 16-22).

Particularly, the Office Action admitted that the above-mentioned features are not disclosed expressly by Isaac and relies upon Pettersen to disclose such features. However, nothing was found in Pettersen that discloses, either expressly or implicitly, the above mentioned features recited in claim 4. Further, nothing was found in Carlson to cures the deficiencies of

Isaac and Pettersen as discussed above. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 4 is patentable over Isaac, Carlson, and Pettersen.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

On page 16, item 12, the Office Action rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Isaac, Carlson and Pettersen, in view of Bautista-Lloyd et al. (Patent No. 7,000,008 B2; filing date: April 16, 2001 hereinafter Bautista-Lloyd) further in view of Hawes. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is submitted that claim 5, which depends from claim 4, is patentable over Isaac, Carlson and Pettersen, taken alone or in combination, for at least the same reasons as base claim 4. Further, nothing was cited or found in either Bautista-Lloyd or Hawes that cures the deficiencies of Isaac, Carlson and Pettersen, as discussed above with respect to claim 4. Thus, it is submitted that claim 5 is patentable over Isaac, Carlson, Pettersen, Bautista-Lloyd, and Hawes, taken alone or in combination.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

On page 18, item 14, the Office Action rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Bautista-Lloyd in view of Hawes, further in view of Pettersen. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 has been amended to recite "making a storage portion store the determined dynamically-altered contents in connection with Web page identifying information on the Web page and user identifying information on the user" (claim 7, lines 12-15). Therefore, it is submitted that claim 7 is patentable over Pettersen for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 4. Further, nothing was found in either Bautista-Lloyd or Hawes that cures the deficiencies of Pettersen as discussed above. Thus, it is submitted that claim 4 is patentable over Bautista-Lloyd, Hawes, and Peterson, taken alone or in combination.

Summary

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _____June 25, 2008_____   By: _____/Sheetal S. Patel/_____
                                            Sheetal S. Patel
                                            Registration No. 59,326

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501